REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 8, 2009. Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20 and 22 to 25 are pending in the application, with Claim 18 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter and without conceding the correctness of the rejection applied against it. Claims 7, 12, 17, 19, 20, 24 and 25 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8 , 11, 12, 17, 18, 22 and 23 were objected to for informalities. Without conceding the correctness of any objection, the majority of the objections have been attended to by amendment in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, as set out above. The objection to Claim 8, however, is traversed. In particular, independent Claim 7 recites functionality performed in the case that a resource is a font or a form or a color profile, whereas Claim 8 explicitly recites that the resource is at least a font, a form or a color profile. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8, 12, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,400 (Sasaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,328,405 (Aschenbrenner). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Aschenbrenner and U.S. Patent No. 6,525,721 (Thomas). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Aschenbrenner and U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0105661 (Nishida). Claims 19, 20 and 22 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of "PostScript Printer Description File Format Specification" (hereafter "the PostScript specification"). Claims 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of the PostScript specification. In this regard, the amendments above have been made solely in an effort to address the objections raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the art rejections, and their withdrawal is respectfully requested as discussed more fully below.

Claims 7, 12 and 17

Independent Claims 7, 12 and 17 generally concern downloading resources to a device having a printing function. A resource which is downloadable to the device is determined (Claims 7 and 12) or selected (Claim 17).

According to aspects of Claims 7, 12 and 17, there is a changeover to (or performance of) processing for adding on a font or a form designated by a user and not stored in the device, and deleting a font or a form stored in the device and not designated by the user.

By virtue of this arrangement, in which unnecessary forms or fonts not designated by the user are deleted from the device, it is ordinarily possible to prevent garbled characters or layouts caused by confusion between multiple different forms and fonts.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 7 is directed to a resource processing method for downloading resources to a device having a printing function. The method includes a decision step of determining processing of a resource, which is downloadable to the device, in dependence upon the resource to be downloaded to the device. The method also includes a changeover step of changing over to processing of the resource based upon a result of a decision made in the decision step. If the resource is a font or a form, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding on a font or a form designated by a user and not stored in the device and deleting a font or a form stored in the device and not designated by the user, or, if the resource is a color profile, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding on a color profile designated by the user and not stored in the device without deleting a color profile stored in the device and not designated by the user.

Independent Claim 12 is directed to an apparatus substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 7.

Independent Claim 17 is directed to a resource processing method for downloading resources to a device having a printing function. The method includes a reception step of making a resource selection of a font, a form or a color profile as a type of resource, which is downloadable to the device. The method also includes a process step of performing processing for adding on a font or a form designated by a user and not stored in the device and deleting a font or a form stored in the device and not designated by the user for the device in accordance with a user instruction if the selected resource is the font or the form, or performing processing for adding on a color profile designated by the user and not stored in the device without deleting a color profile stored in the device and not designated by the user.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 7, 12 and 17, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of changing over to (or performing) processing for adding on a font or a form designated by a user and not stored in a device and deleting font or a form stored in the device and not designated by the user.

Page 8 of the Office Action concedes that Sasaki does not disclose changing over to processing for adding on a font or form designated by a user and not stored in the device and deleting a font or form stored in the device and not designated by the user.

Nevertheless, the Office Action relies on Aschenbrenner (Figure 3, Column 11, lines 11 to 21 and Column 12, lines 51 to 59) for this feature.

As understood by Applicants, Aschenbrenner is directed to tagging document objects with secondary resources that specify rendering attributes. See Aschenbrenner, Abstract. Downloaded resources can be held temporarily for a print job by caching, or can be held semi-permanently by "capturing". If the storage area for captured resources is full, captured resources may be deleted based on, for example, a least-recently-used scheme. See Aschenbrenner, Column 11, lines 7 to 25.

In this regard, the Office Action asserts:

> "That is, ASCHENBRENNER teaches that complex, re-usable resources like a color profile (which are associated with a printing mechanism and its colorants) are preferably captured by the printer (i.e. added without deleting earlier-stored profiles). Conversely, less complex resources (e.g. fonts and forms which are associated with a printing document) can be cached by the printer (i.e. added on and deleted after use)." Office Action, pages 10 and 11 (emphasis added); see also Office Action, page 48.

However, Aschenbrenner is not seen to disclose or suggest that fonts and forms are less complex resources. Moreover, the cited portions of Aschenbrenner only recite a "preference" for using a particular type of universal ID for complex resources, and not necessarily a preference for capturing complex resources or caching less complex resources. See Aschenbrenner, Column 12, lines 51 to 59. Additionally, even accepting for purpose of arguments that a preference for saving complex resources exists in Aschenbrenner, it is not seen that this necessarily suggests that fonts or forms are deleted more quickly, much less that a font or form designated by a user and not stored in the device is added while a font or form stored in the device and not designated by the user is deleted.

Thomas, Nishida, and the PostScript specification have been reviewed and are not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Sasaki and Aschenbrenner.

Therefore, independent Claims 7, 12, and 17 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 20, 24 and 25

Independent Claims 19, 20, 24 and 25 generally concern displaying a color profile capable of being loaded into a device having a printing function. Information of a destination device and types of page description language used for the destination device are acquired.

According to one aspect of Claims 19, 20, 24 and 25, types of color profiles capable of being loaded into the destination device are determined in accordance with the acquired types of page description language.

By virtue of this feature, it is ordinarily possible to ensure that a color profile is usable at a destination device.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 19 is directed to a resource display method for displaying a color profile capable of being loaded into a device having a printing function. The method includes a step of acquiring information of a destination device and acquiring types of page description language used for the destination device, and a step of determining types of color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with the types of page description language acquired in the acquiring step. The method also includes a step of identifying a color profile, which is loadable into the destination device, based upon the types of color profile determined and color space information of a loadable target color profile, a step of displaying the color profile identified.

Independent Claim 24 is directed to an apparatus substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 19.

Independent Claim 20 is directed to a resource display method for displaying a color profile capable of being loaded into a device having a printing function. The method includes a step of acquiring information of a destination device and acquiring types of page description language used for the destination device, and a step of determining types of color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with the types of page description language acquired in the acquiring step. The method further includes a step of identifying a color profile, which is loadable into the destination device, based upon comparison between the types of color profile determined and color space information of a loadable target color profile, and a step of displaying the color profile identified.

Independent Claim 25 is directed to an apparatus substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 24.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 19, 20, 24 and 25, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of determining types of color profiles capable of being loaded into a destination device in accordance with acquired types of page description language.

Page 29 of the Office Action concedes that Sasaki does not disclose or suggest determining types of color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with acquired types of page description language.

Nevertheless, the Office Action relies on the PostScript specification (pages 92 to 93) for this feature. As understood by Applicants, the PostScript specification is directed to describing an approach for using PostScript printer description files (PPD files).

Page 30 of the Office Action asserts:

> “The ‘PostScript Printer Description File Format Specification’, version 4.3, 1996-Feb-9, pages 92-93 teaches that a PostScript® Printer Description file may specify "color rendering dictionaries" (i.e., color profiles) that are used in a printer. That is, for a specific type of page description language (e.g., PostScript®), an association is made between the page description language and the types of color profiles (i.e., color rendering dictionaries). Given an acquired type of page description language, one can determine types of color profiles from the printer description file.” Office Action, page 30 (emphasis added).

However, the cited portions of the PostScript specification are seen to relate only to one type of page description language, namely, the PostScript language. More specifically, the cited portions simply disclose that in the PostScript language, different color models can be selected for imaging, and that a color rendering dictionary (CRD) code can be used to calibrate device colors. See the PostScript specification, pages 92 and 93. Thus, the PostScript specification is not seen to disclose using multiple types of page description languages at all, much less determining types of color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with acquired types of page description language.

Thomas, Nishida, and Aschenbrenner have been reviewed and are not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Sasaki and the PostScript specification.

Therefore, independent Claims 19, 20, 24 and 25 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the claims, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.